



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HAMRE, SCHUMANN,
MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. BOX 2902
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-0902

COPY MAILED

JUL 18 2008

In re Application of	:	
Asplin	:	
Application No. 09/687,445	:	DECISION
Filed: 13 October, 2000	:	
Attorney Docket No. 20158.2US01	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed on 26 November, 2007, to revive an application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having been abandoned due to unintentional delay.

The Office regrets the delay in addressing this matter, however, the instant petition was presented to the attorneys in the Office of Petitions only at this writing.

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee. (However, it does not appear that a terminal disclaimer and fee are due here.)

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

Application No. 09/687,445

Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 27 September, 2006, with reply due under a non-extendable deadline on or before 26 December, 2006.

The application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 26 December, 2006.

The Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 26 April, 2007.

The 14 May, 2007, petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment (under 37 C.F.R. §1.181) was dismissed on 24 September, 2007, for failure to satisfy the required showing (no due date docket in evidence) and failure to file timely.

On 26 November, 2007, Petitioner submitted the instant petition with fee, with a reply in the form of an amendment, and made a statement of unintentional delay, which statement was made by the inventor in light of the fact that present Counsel was not of record when the application went abandoned and so was not in a position to make the statement of unintentional delay.

The record (including the petitions filed on 14 May, 2007, and 26 November, 2007) does not necessitate a finding that the delay between midnight 26 December, 2006 (the date of abandonment), and 26 November, 2007 (the date of filing of grantable petition), was not unintentional.

Rather, the Patent and Trademark Office is relying in this matter on the duty of candor and good faith of Petitioner Charles Lee Asplin and his Counsel James A. Larson (Reg. No. 40,443) when accepting Petitioners' representation that the delay in filing the response was unintentional.¹

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice *and* all others who make representations before the Office must inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.²

¹ See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).

² See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office). See specifically, the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §10.18.

Application No. 09/687,445

STATUTES, REGULATIONS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a Petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application.^{3, 4}

CONCLUSION

The instant petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **granted**.

The instant application is released to Technology Center/AU 3671 for further processing in due course.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the instant decision to ensure that the revival has been acknowledged by the Technology Center/AU in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to that change in status need be directed to the Technology Center/AU where that change of status must be effected—that does not occur in the Office of Petitions.

³ See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition. (Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.) Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable. Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a). And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter. Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care. (By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.))

Application No. 09/687,445

While telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214, it is noted that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2⁵) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).



/John J. Gillon, Jr./
John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁵ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.